Serial No.: 10/601,959 Art Unit: 2816

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 17, 2004. Through this response, independent claims 1 and 28 have been amended, and claims 18, 19, and 29-38 have been cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Claims 1-11, 13-17, 20-25, and 28 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

# I. Objection to Claims

According to the Office Action, claims 19 and 25 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's statement that claims 19 and 25 would be allowable.

Applicants have cancelled claims 18 and 19, and have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 18 and 19. Since the claim amendments have resulted in allowable claims, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

# II. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 33-37 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, according to the following reasons stated in the Office Action:

Claims 33-37 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 33, there is no support for the recited "first cascode transistor pair".

Serial No.: 10/601,959

Art Unit: 2816

Claims 34-37 are rejected as including the indefiniteness discussed

above with claim 33.

Applicants have cancelled claims 33-37, and thus the rejection to the same is

rendered moot.

III. Rejection of Claims 28-30 and 32-38 Under 35 USC § 102 (b)

A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 28-30 and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as allegedly

being anticipated by Kawasaki (U.S. Pat. No. 5,955,904). Applicants have cancelled

claims 30-38, and thus the rejection to the same is rendered moot. Independent claim 28,

which incorporates the limitations of claim 29, will be addressed below. As pertaining to

independent claim 28, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

B. Discussion of the Rejection

It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under

35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated based upon a single reference, the reference must

disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the

claim at issue. See, e.g., In Re Dow Chemical, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988),

and In re Keller, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the

Kawasaki reference.

**Independent Claim 28** 

As recited in independent claim 28, Applicants claim (with emphasis added):

-11-

Serial No.: 10/601,959

Art Unit: 2816

#### 28. A method of pumping a charge in a semiconductor based charge pump for use in a phase lock loop circuit, comprising:

receiving first and second input signals at first and second switching transistors provided in the charge pump;

providing a substantially constant reference voltage to first and second complementary transistors to reduce coupling noise from the first and second switching transistors, wherein the complementary transistors change states between off and on substantially complementary to the state of the respective first and second switching transistors;

generating a first output signal from the second complementary transistor; and

filtering noise from the reference signal to provide a second output signal to a voltage-to-current converter.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kawasaki* does not disclose the emphasized features. The Office Action refers to FIGS. 3-5 of Kawasaki, and in particular, equates the claimed features with features provided in two differential amplifiers 42 and 52 that are implemented in two separate circuits (a clock input circuit 16 and a clock-enable-signal input circuit 20, respectively). The two separate circuits do not comprise a charge pump, nor a method for pumping charge into the same.

Further, Kawasaki does not disclose outputting a filtered reference signal to a voltage-to-current converter. Because Kawasaki fails to recite these and the above claimed features, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to independent claim 28 be withdrawn.

#### IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

#### Rejection of Claims 1-11, 13-18, 20-24, 28-30 and 32-38 A.

Claims 1, 8-11, 13-18, 20-24, 28-30 and 32-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. ("Lee," U.S. Pat. No. 5,889,437) in

Art Unit: 2816

view of Abdi et al. ("Abdi," U.S. Pat. No. 5,722,052). Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Abdi and Ahashi. Applicants

traverse these rejections, and believe the rejections to be moot in light of the current

amendments.

Discussion of the Rejection В.

As has been acknowledged by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the U.S.

Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has the burden under section 103 to establish a

proper case of obviousness by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or generally

available knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art that would lead that individual to the

claimed invention. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir.

1988). Accordingly, to make a proper case for obviousness, there must be a prior art

teaching or established knowledge that would suggest to a person having ordinary skill in

the pertinent art to fill the voids apparent in the applied reference. It is respectfully asserted

that no such case has been made in the outstanding Office Action.

Claims 1-11, 13-17, 20-25

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of

previous claims 18 and 19, which according to the Office Action results in allowable

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to independent claim 1 be

withdrawn, as the aforementioned amendment has placed claim 1 in condition for

allowance. Because claims 2-11, 13-17, and 20-25 include the limitations of allowable

claim 1, claims 2-11, 13-17, and 20-25 are allowable as a matter of law.

-13-

Serial No.: 10/601,959

Art Unit: 2816

Claims 28, 30, and 32-38

With regard to independent claim 28, neither Abdi nor Lee, alone or in combination,

disclose, teach, or suggest filtering noise from the reference signal to provide a second

output signal to a voltage-to-current converter, as recited in independent claim 28. As

indicated in the Office Action, Lee does not disclose a reference signal, and Abdi does not

teach filtering noise from a reference signal to provide a second output signal to a

voltage-to-current converter. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to

claim 28 be withdrawn.

With regard to independent claim 30 and dependent claims 32-38, Applicants have

cancelled these claims and thus the rejection to the same has been rendered moot.

V. Cancelled Claims

As identified above, claims 18, 19, and 29-38 have been cancelled from the

application through this response without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants

reserve the right to present these cancelled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing

applications to be filed subsequently.

-14-

Serial No.: 10/601,959 Art Unit: 2816

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully assert that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-11, 13-17, 20-25, and 28 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.

By:

David Rodack Reg. No. 47,034

100 Galleria Parkway N.W. Suite 1750 Atlanta, Georgia 30339 (770) 933-9500